



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

unholy ambitions. At times he falls into political disquisitions ; one of the most instructive passages of this kind is that in which he discourses on Liberals and liberalism (without the capital, I. 199). The terms altar and throne are usually found together in his pages ; opponents of the monarchical supremacy are *ipso facto* atheists ; government is effective just in proportion to its identification of the interests of Church and State. He is a strong supporter of all the distinctive Ultra-Royalist measures of the Villèle period, and a bitter opponent of the press ; he condemns the removal of the censure at the beginning of the reign of Charles X. and advises the government to make use of its exceptional powers to punish the courts for not condemning journals.

In this intolerance of public opinion our author deviates from the anti-Villèle Ultras, for the simple reason that he is Ministerialist and they are in opposition. It is necessary to keep in mind the split in the Royalist ranks that became pronounced in the new Chamber of 1824 ; the dismissal of Chateaubriand and Bellune from the ministry converted a latent hostility to Villèle into active opposition, and from this time on these "Royalistes de la Défection" attacked Villèle and his measures on every occasion. This opposition was undoubtedly factious and unprincipled : but it is evident that Salaberry in his condemnation of it (almost as marked a feature of the *Souvenirs* as hatred of the Liberals) is equally impelled by personal influences. His positions differed in no important degree from the extreme Ultra ones, and he repeatedly urges measures fully as unwise and arbitrary as those finally adopted. He continues loyal to Villèle to the end. The Martignac administration he condemns as one of concessions by which only the revolutionists profited, while that of Polignac, while monarchical and religious, is weak and disunited (II. 276, 284).

The divergence of M. de Salaberry as a close adherent of Villèle from the party with which he is really in sympathy, brings him into some difficulties and inconsistencies, especially in connection with the Spanish war. But perhaps it is not particularly profitable to dwell on the vagaries of this weak-headed and narrow-spirited, though undoubtedly upright and gallant gentleman. On the whole it would seem that his admiring posterity were ill-advised in permitting his paper to go to publication in this form, and that we need not be moved by any acute sense of gratitude for their oversight.

VICTOR COFFIN.

Russia and the Russians. By EDMUND NOBLE. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. 285.)

MR. NOBLE is one of the very few American writers who have attempted to make a serious study of Russia, present and past, and we hail him as such. To be sure, the fact that he is the author of *The Russian Revolt* and the correspondent of *Free Russia* will in itself suggest the likelihood of certain limitations to his capacity as an historian. It is not, however, a history strictly speaking that he has tried to give us in

his latest work ; it is rather a series of connected sketches, in thirteen chapters, "The Land and the People," "Laying the Foundations," "How Russia Became an Autocracy," etc. This method may have the advantage of enabling him to disregard any lack of proportion between his different topics and of allowing a more rhetorical treatment ; but, as a result, the book is neither one thing nor the other. It has not the structure of a good short history, and there are far too many primary facts for a series of essays. The scholar will find nothing in it particularly useful, and no method can excuse some of the inaccuracies.

Mr. Noble seems to have meant to write carefully. He has used excellent authorities and evidently has wished to be studiously moderate, though continually indulging in sweeping statements. His belief that "We are thus entitled to regard the autocratic régime in Russia as maintained not in the interest of the people but in the interest of a ruling class" does not very often crop up to vitiate his impartiality, especially in the earlier part of his work. As one would expect, like most other western liberals, he is not fair to the national Greek Orthodox Church, or to its source, the Byzantine Empire. His broad style of narration, too, leads him to treat controverted and even very doubtful facts as if they were generally accepted truths, as for instance when he calls the princess Tarakánov (p. 91) the daughter of the man he dubs Alexander Alexei Gregorovich Razumovsky (a piling up of names utterly impossible in Russian), and of the Empress Elizabeth. Again, his love of the picturesque makes him forget in the enthusiasm of his description of the baptism of Vladimir's followers (p. 28) that the ceremony took place in the Dnieper not the Volkhov, *i. e.*, near Kiev not Novgorod, in southern not northern Russia.

To continue our fault-finding, it is hardly worth while to note an occasional misplaced accent or questionable transcription ; what we have to criticize is the inaccuracy of many of Mr. Noble's facts. For instance he exaggerates the isolating influence of the language in cutting off Russia from the west. Russian is not harder than Polish, nor is it a non-European language like Hungarian ; and even the use of a different script was not such a serious barrier from the rest of the world. Any one can learn the modern simpler Russian alphabet in half an hour. It is a little astonishing, moreover, to find an author who really knows so much about Russia still believing the absurdity (p. 81) that the Urals were "the boundaries thus apparently marked out for them by nature." The Urals are less of a natural boundary than are the Alleghanies. If Mr. Noble had read Cahun's *Turcs et Mongols* he would scarcely have repeated the old fable of "the enormous numerical superiority" of the Tartars (p. 47), and his statement that "in 1480, the power of the Asiatics was finally brought to an end by Iván the Terrible," is to say the least very confusing. Iván III., whom this must mean, was given the name of the "Terrible," but he is always known as the "Great" and the term "Terrible" has become indissolubly linked with his grandson Iván IV. Utterly unpardonable indeed, are such errors as making

Mikhail Románov a descendant of Iván (p. 65), and as saying (p. 161) that Alexéi Mikháilovich intrusted the work of revising the sacred books to Maxim the Greek (who lived a full century earlier), and that serfdom was instituted about the middle of the seventeenth century, whereas the decisive steps were taken in 1597. The mention (p. 88) of "the struggle with the Turks (1736-1739), peace with whom Anna after losing 100,000 men obtained through the mediation of France," does not convey a correct impression of a war where the Russian arms met with nearly uniform success even if the treaty of peace was unsatisfactory. For what possible reason in the previous sentence is Augustus II. called "Auguste"? He was not a Frenchman, but a German named "August," which is also the Polish way of spelling the name. Finally let us charitably assume that it was a slip of the pen which caused (p. 118) Constantine and Nicholas to be described as the sons instead of the brothers of Alexander I. As for the last chapter, "The Future of Russia," its various conclusions and prophecies need not detain us.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Surveys, Historic and Economic. By W. J. ASHLEY, M.A., Professor of Economic History in Harvard University. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xxvii, 476.)

To those who have followed Mr. Ashley's scattered contributions to the periodicals, this collection of his minor writings will bring little that is unfamiliar. About two-thirds of its contents have appeared in various economic journals. One-half the remainder is from the pages of *The Nation* or *THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*. Less than one-eighth of the whole is now printed for the first time. The subjects treated range from "English Serfdom" to "Harvard Scholarships," and from "The Canadian Sugar Combine" to "The Tory Origin of Free Trade." But the book, in spite of its superficial diversities, has elements of essential unity. It is informed by a vigorous personality, it is dominated by definite convictions, and it faces in the direction in which much historical work is now looking. "We who concern ourselves with economic history," declares the author, "have with us the current of the world's thought." The period of constitution-making which followed the French Revolution produced its political historians, its Guizots and Hallams and Grotes. The centuries following the Reformation show an imposing procession of historians of the Church. "Precisely in the same way the pressure of modern economic problems is certain to produce, has already begun to produce, a whole literature of economic history." Of the extent and character of much of this literature, Mr. Ashley's *Surveys* afford a good indication. Out of his forty-five articles over thirty are reviews—some of them elaborate reviews—of recent works dealing with economic history. Indeed not more than ten of the whole number appear to be altogether independent of some specific book.

The essays and reviews thus brought together Mr. Ashley has arranged in eight "well-marked groups" entitled: (1) Preliminaries (already